

## **REMARKS**

The above amendment and these remarks are responsive to the Final Office Action of 27 Jan 2003 by Examiner Elaine L. Gort.

Claims 24-28 are in the case, none having been allowed.

### ***Interview***

Applicants' attorney expresses appreciation for courtesy extended by Examiners Elaine Gort and Kenneth Rice in the interview conducted at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on 7 April 2003.

The interview focused on approaches to amending the claims in such a way that all data would receive patentable weight in response to art rejections regarding mere intended use and non-functional data.

**35 U.S.C. 103**

Claims 24 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Gundewar et al. (U.S. Patent 67,381,610) in view of Noori.

Gundewar describes a method for automated project planning based on templates (col. 1, lines 49-55) and associated work flow (figure 4).

The Examiner asserts that:

"Gundewar discloses a system and method for coordinating a project capable of maintaining a database of templates with user terminals accessible via a server." (Office Action, page 7)..

In apparent response to applicants contention that in Gundewar there is no suggestion of the steps explicitly recited in applicants claims, the Examiner cites Noorie for the teaching at page 378 that in project management it is known to ensure the project is carried out within a budget.

Applicants have amended claim 24 and added new claims 26-27 to positively recite the specific master and

subsidiary tasks executed by users with respect to a database structure and specific user interface during the preparing stage of a five stage process including assessing, preparing, developing, deploying and supporting stages for building a customer's legacy process into a general procurement and accounts payable application.

Applicants request that the rejection of claims 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103 be withdrawn.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION


Applicants urge that the above amendments be entered and the case passed to issue with claims 24-28.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conversation with applicant(s) attorney could possibly facilitate prosecution of the case, he may be reached at the number noted below.

Sincerely,

R. F. Barnard, et al.

By

  
Shelley M Beckstrand  
Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 14 May 2003

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.  
Attorney at Law  
314 Main Street  
Owego, NY 13827

Phone: (607) 687-9913  
Fax: (607) 687-7848